



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,799	01/07/2005	Keizou Kawahara	358362011000	8291
25227 7590 06/12/2008 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD SUITE 400 MCLEAN, VA 22102			EXAMINER AUGHENBAUGH, WALTER	
			ART UNIT 1794	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/12/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement of Applicant's Amendments

1. The amendments made in claims 1-3 in the Amendment filed February 11, 2008 (Amdt. A) have been received and considered by Examiner.

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

2. All rejections made of record in the previous Office Action mailed October 9, 2007 have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in claims 1 and 3 in Amdt. A.

NEW REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by El-Afandi et al. (USPN 5,849,401).

In regard to claim 1, El-Afandi et al. teach an easy-tear (col. 20, lines 32-35) stretched aliphatic polyester film comprising a lactic acid-based polyester resin as a main component (col. 21, line 1-col. 22, line 25) and having an edge tear strength in the longitudinal and transverse directions of, for example, 18 g*f and 14 g*f, respectively (which are equivalent to 0.177 N and 0.137 N, respectively), values that are both less than 22 N (see line 1 of Table 1 in col. 22; "g*f" is "grams of force"). Each of the other examples listed in Table 1 also have edge tear strength in the longitudinal and transverse directions that are all less than 22 N (100 g*f = 0.981 N).

Art Unit: 1794

In regard to claim 4, the recitation “which is produced by irradiation of actinic rays on a stretched aliphatic polyester film” has been given little patentable weight since the recitation is a method limitation that has been given little patentable weight since the method of forming the film is not germane to the issue of patentability of the film itself, and since the present claim language does not structurally distinguish the claimed invention from that which is taught by the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over El-Afandi et al. (USPN 5,849,401).

In regard to claim 2, El-Afandi et al. teach the lactic acid-based polyester film as discussed above in regard to claim 1.

El-Afandi et al. fail to teach that the film has the claimed molecular absorption coefficient at the claimed wavelength.

However, “the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art’s functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer.” *Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). *In re Crish*, 393 F.3d 1253, 1258, 73 USPQ2d 1364, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2004), the court held that the claimed promoter sequence obtained by sequencing a prior art plasmid that was not previously sequenced was anticipated by the prior art plasmid which necessarily possessed the same DNA sequence as the claimed oligonucleotides. The court stated that “just as the discovery of properties of a known material does not make it novel, the identification and characterization of a prior art material also does not make it novel.” *Id.* MPEP 2112.

In regard to claim 3, El-Afandi et al. teach an easy-to-tear (col. 20, lines 32-35) stretched aliphatic polyester film comprising a lactic acid-based polyester resin as a main component (col. 21, line 1-col. 22, line 25) as discussed above in regard to claim 1. The films listed in Table 8 also correspond to the film claimed in claim 1 (col. 26, lines 12-60).

El-Afandi et al. fail to explicitly teach that the film has a tear energy within the claimed tear energy range and a tensile impact strength that is greater or equal to than the claimed minimum tensile impact strength.

Art Unit: 1794

However, El-Afandi et al. teach that one of ordinary skill in the art can vary the tear resistance and impact strength of the film via variation of the thicknesses of the layers of the film (col. 26, line 61-col. 27, line 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have varied the thickness of one or more of the layers of the film of El-Afandi et al. in order to achieve the desired tear energy and tensile impact strength depending on the particular desired end result, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art in the absence of unexpected results. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). MPEP 2144.05 II.B.

In regard to claim 4, the recitation “which is produced by irradiation of actinic rays on a stretched aliphatic polyester film” is a method limitation that has been given little patentable weight since the method of forming the film is not germane to the issue of patentability of the film itself, and since the present claim language does not structurally distinguish the claimed invention from that which is taught by the prior art.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments in Amdt. A regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 1-4 are moot due to the withdrawal of these rejections in this Office Action.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter B. Aughenbaugh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1488. While the examiner sets his work schedule under the Increased Flexitime Policy, he can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:45am to 5:15pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye, can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Walter B Aughenbaugh /
Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Rena L. Dye/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794

6/07/08